

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-20 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated March 3, 2006, the Examiner objected to claim 1 due to an informality. Additionally, claims 1, 3-6, 11, and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,481 ("Hoard") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,694,098 ("Warbrick"). Further, claims 7-10 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoard in view of Warbrick and U.S. Pat. No. 5,646,997 ("Barton"). In this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 18 have been amended, claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 20 have been cancelled, and claim 32 has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

II. Claim 1

The Examiner objected to claim 1 due to an informality. Claim 1 has been amended to remove the informality. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 1.

III. Amended Independent Claims 1 and 11 and New Independent Claim 32

Amended independent claims 1 and 11, and new independent claim 32 are directed to a method or system to manipulate in-transit digital signals riding on an optical link. Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton all fail to disclose or suggest manipulating a SMPTE-standard optical stream as recited in claim 1. In particular, Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton all fail to disclose or suggest at least determining whether a particular bit position of a SMPTE-standard optical stream selected by a user for modification is located in an active video portion, a horizontally ancillary data portion, a vertical ancillary data portion, a start video timing portion or an end active video timing portion of the SMPTE-standard optical stream, and then identifying the particular bit position in the determined location. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over the proposed combination of Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to independent claim 1 and any claim that depends on independent claim 1.

Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton all fail to disclose or suggest an apparatus for manipulating a SMPTE-standard optical stream as recited in claim 11. In particular, Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton all fail to disclose or suggest at least a processor determining whether a particular bit position of a SMPTE-standard optical stream selected by a user for modification is located in an active video portion, a horizontally ancillary data portion, a vertical ancillary data portion, a start video timing portion or an end active video timing portion of the SMPTE-standard optical stream, and then identifying the particular bit position in the determined location. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that independent claim 11 is patentable over the proposed combination of Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to independent claim 11 and any claim that depends on independent claim 11.

New independent claim 32 recites splitting a SMPTE-standard optical system into a primary optical stream and a secondary optical stream. The secondary optical stream is converted to an electrical. A data signal and a clock signal are identified from the electrical signal and applied to a programmable delay line. A selection of at least a particular portion of the SMPTE-standard optical stream to be modified is received from a user. It is determined whether the particular portion of the SMPTE-standard video is located in an active video portion, a horizontally ancillary data portion, a vertically ancillary data portion, a start-video timing portion, or an end active video timing portion of the SMPTE-standard video stream, and the particular portion is identified in the determined location. An electrical gating signal is created at the particular portion of the SMPTE-standard video stream and the electrical gating signal is converted to an optical gating signal. The primary optical stream is delayed to provide a delayed optical stream and the delayed optical stream is synchronized with the optical gating signal based on the programmable delay line. The particular portion of the SMPTE-standard video stream is then modified based on the optical gating signal.

As discussed above, Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton all fail to disclose or suggest at least determining whether a particular portion selected by a user for modification is

located in an active video portion, a horizontally ancillary data portion, a vertical ancillary data portion, a start video timing portion or an end active video timing portion of the SMPTE-standard optical stream, and then identifying the particular portion in the determined location. Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton additionally fail to disclose or suggest converting an electrical gating signal to an optical gating signal and the use of a programmable delay line. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits independent claim 32 is patentable over the proposed combination of Hoard, Warbrick, and Barton.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott W. Brim", is written over a horizontal line.

Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200